

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed January 24, 2007, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 have been rejected. In response, the applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 22 and 24, and submitted the following remarks. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and the remarks below.

Examiner Interview

On Wednesday, August 15, 2007, the undersigned and Examiners Frenel and Zeender held a telephone conference regarding the above-referenced matter. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiners for their time and attention in this matter. During the interview, claim 1 was discussed in light of the prior art references Ribitzky, Evans and Cooke. A specific agreement was not reached, however the Examiners indicated that there are aspects of the invention that may be patentable over the prior art. The amendments made above are made pursuant to the Examiners' comments and suggestions.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, and 22-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,393 to Ribitzky (hereafter Ribitzky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,675 to Evans et al.(hereafter Evans), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,629 to Cooke, Jr. et al (hereinafter Cooke).

The Applicants have amended the independent claims of the present application to include the functionality of either the PACS or the RIS workstation to allow a user to communicate with a user of the other application through the container application. Because the functionality code segments of the present application are formatted with the same look and feel, not only may a user utilize the container application to communicate with each of the PACS and the RIS systems, but a user may also utilize the PACS or RIS

workstation to communicate and exchange information with the other through the container application. The above amendments to the independent claims reflect this functionality. Furthermore, the Applicants have amended the claim 24 to correct a typographical error.

The Applicant respectfully submits that, as discussed in the Examiner interview of August 15, 2007, neither Ribitzky, Evans, nor Cooke teach such functionality. It is acknowledged that the Ribitzky reference does include a container application, and that the Cooke reference includes a PACS and RIS system. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the Evans reference includes a uniform user interface. However none of these references, either alone or in combination teach or make obvious the functionality of the present, specifically, the ability to not only communicate with a common user interface in a container application with both a PACS and RIS application, but also to communicate from and to a PACS and RIS application through a container application. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are now in a condition for allowance.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a data management system for patient data, comprising: a picture archival and communication system (PACS) having a functionality code segment and a first user interface code segment; a radiology information system (RIS) having a functionality code segment and a second user interface code segment; a container application having a first user interface layer in communication with the PACS and a second user interface layer in communication with the RIS, wherein the first and second user interface layers are configured to convert the first user interface code segment of the PACS and the second user interface code segment of the RIS to a uniform user interface and communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the PACS and the RIS, respectively, and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and the RIS are formatted with the same look and feel; and further wherein each of the PACS and the RIS include a

workstation configured such that patient data can be communicated between the PACS and RIS workstations through the container application..

As described above, neither Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, nor their combination teach or make obvious a functionality code segment and a user interface code segment, nor a uniform user interface to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the components and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 28-31 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 20-31 are also allowable being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 7 is directed to a data management system for patient data. For the same reasons described above for Claim 1, the independent Claim 7 is also allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination.

Claims 8 and 10-11 depend upon the independent Claim 7. As described above, the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 10-11 are also allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 22 is directed to a method of displaying patient data from a plurality of applications. For the reasons described above in Claims 1 and 7, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination.

Claims 23-27 depend upon the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 23-27 are also allowable being dependent upon allowable base claim.

Application No. 09/543,663
Amendment Dated August 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2007

For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (414)271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By Christopher M. Scherer
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Attorney Docket No.: 15-IS-5288 (5024-00039)